



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXXI. BOSTON, AUGUST and SEPTEMBER, 1909.

No. 8

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR. TEN CENTS PER COPY

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Matter.

Make all checks payable to the American Peace Society. To personal checks on Western and Southern banks add ten cents for collecting.

CONTENTS.	PAGE
EDITORIALS	173-177
Statesmanship of Peace—Frederick de Martens—The Bolivia-Peru Boundary Dispute—The Stockholm Peace Congress and the Progress of the Peace Movement.	
EDITORIAL NOTES	178
International Peace Press Union—Park College Cosmopolitan Club.	
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	178-179
BREVITIES	179-180
GENERAL ARTICLES:	
The Anglo-German Antagonism. <i>Senator d'Estournelles de Constant</i>	180-181
The Cost of Armed Peace. <i>Hon. J. A. Tawney</i>	181-183
The Path to Peace. <i>Andrew Carnegie</i>	184-185
Interdependence vs. Independence of Nations. <i>Prof. Paul S. Reinsch</i>	185-187
The Evolution of World Peace. <i>Levi T. Pennington</i>	187-189
A Plea for Calm Reflection in International Affairs.	189
Mars Must Die. <i>Poem. Lyman R. Bayard</i>	189
The Fifth British National Peace Congress	189-191
NEW BOOKS	181-192
International Arbitration and Peace Lecture Bureau	193

Statesmanship of Peace.

Little observation is needed to convince one that statesmanship in our day is rapidly becoming a very different thing from what it was half a century ago. Some of the greatest international wars of the last century, if not all of them, were brought on by the deliberate machinations of statesmen, abroad or at home. It is now known that there was no mystery about the origin of the Crimean War; it was purposely brought on by British and French statesmanship, so-called, particularly the former. The manner in which the Franco-Prussian War, whatever may have been the real causes back of it, was finally launched by the perverse activities of prominent statesmen is too well understood to need more than mention. Examples of the baneful activity of statesmanship of this old type might be multiplied at will.

Alongside of these heartless and ignoble performances it is a great comfort to be able to place the work of English, Russian and French statesmen which prevented war, perhaps on a more colossal scale than the Crimean, at the time of the recent Dogger Bank incident; that of German and French statesmen at the time of Emperor William's "call"

at Tangier and later when the Casablanca trouble occurred; that of the statesmen of Sweden and Norway at the time of the separation of the two countries; and that of our own statesmen and those of Japan during the past year and a half. It is this new spirit that is everywhere pervading statesmanship that gives us some sense of security in the presence of the menace of the gigantic armaments of the day. If these armaments were accompanied by a statesmanship of the Palmerstonian or Bismarckian type the world would without doubt be turned upside down in an incredibly short time. We have the new statesmanship of such men as John Hay, Elihu Root, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Léon Bourgeois, Marquis Katsura, and their like in other countries, to thank that the legitimate fruits of rivalry in armaments have not long ago been gathered.

A good example of how the new statesmanship is taking advantage of almost every possible opportunity to promote sentiments of goodwill and peace was furnished by the celebration of the tercentenary of the discovery of Lake Champlain last month. President Taft, ex-Secretary of State Root, Ambassador Jusserand of France, and Ambassador Bryce of Great Britain were all there, and gave such an atmosphere of friendliness and peace to the occasion that even the newspapers, which are in general so accustomed to jump and scream at every hint of war, took up the refrain and made even their headlines eloquent for international goodwill and concord. It might have been expected, judging from many similar celebrations of the past, that the surroundings, the ruins of old Fort Ticonderoga, the memory of the many bloody battles that had there been fought, would have aroused at least some of the old-time war spirit and glorification of battles. There was indeed something of this in part of the exercises, in which military display was made prominent, but these great leaders did not indulge in this sort of barbaric and outworn stuff. They all committed their several countries, as far as could be done by them, to policies of peace. They expressed the hope that never again might peace among the nations of the world be interrupted by war.

Ambassador Jusserand struck the key-note. He was strong and felicitous in his expression of goodwill toward the United States, toward Great Britain and toward all the world. He feelingly alluded to the fact that France and Great Britain are soon to celebrate the completion of one hundred years of

peace between them. Ambassador Bryce, always a statesman of peace, alluding to the men at arms and the martial scenes around him, to the old cannon and rusty relics, declared himself nevertheless to be "a man of peace." He could not but believe that the Creator meant this beautiful spot for something else than fighting, and he trusted that it would never see fighting again. He admired the courage of the French and the English who had fought at Ticonderoga, but he hoped that they would never, never do it again. President Taft, following the Ambassadors, and giving a brief review of the history of the Champlain valley, said that the battles which for two hundred years were fought there "were never to recur again." "I echo and emphasize," he said, "the statements of the Ambassadors, and repeat their prayer that never again may this great valley be given a name in history by reason of its being the seat of bloody war."

These noble utterances have much more significance than many are disposed to give to them. They are typical of the time and of the advanced stage which the movement for world peace has reached. It is easy enough to say that such speech is mere talk, mere celebration gush, and that it is all forgotten and discarded as soon as the occasion is past. Once this was often true; it is so no longer. Men like Taft and Root, Bryce and Jusserand do not indulge in mere gush. They say what they mean. The talk of such men is dynamic. It has a power for good that many do not appreciate. If they only keep on talking, and men like them in other countries keep on talking, as so many of them have been talking in recent years, they will ultimately be able to talk the possibility of war to death, and talk out of existence the huge armaments which now burden and torture the world. Many wars have been merely talked and written into existence in other days, when there was no real cause for them. Why may not peace, universal and permanent, be equally well talked and written into existence, even against the greatest obstacles? Such power has persistent human speech.

President Taft and the French and British Ambassadors have made three nations, or rather all the nations, their debtors by the sincere and courageous demand for unbroken peace uttered by them under the shadow of the old fort of Ticonderoga, where men once did each other to death in the fierce roar and rage of battle. Their words are the expression of more than a mere wish, more than a demand; they are a luminous prophecy of what is just before us; a fine interpretation of the course which the world is rapidly taking away from the brutalities and absurdities of war toward the final destiny of humanity — friendship and brotherhood, coöperation and peace — accompanied by a prosperity as yet undreamed of, an era of joy and happiness unbounded.

Let us have the statesmanship of peace everywhere and on all occasions.

Frederick de Martens.

The death of Frederick de Martens of Russia, a member of the State Council, has taken away one of the leading and most influential of the workers for the organization of the world on a basis of law and peace. In the years preceding the first Hague Conference his service lay in the field of international law and as a representative of Russia in a number of important international conferences. He was the author of a number of valuable works on international law, professor of the subject at the University of St. Petersburg, and universally recognized as probably the foremost authority of the time in this field. He was sometimes called in Europe the Lord Chief Justice of Christendom.

Professor de Martens was one of the first to give international law its modern practical direction. He believed that, through treaties and conventions dealing with the various common interests of the nations, international law might be lifted out of its former vagueness and placed on such a basis of definiteness and positiveness as to make it an effective instrument in working out a practical union of the states. He thought that this was the aim which all workers in this field should set for themselves. In this direction he steadily worked himself, and had unusual opportunities to do so in the many international gatherings to which he was sent by his government. He was a member of the Brussels Conference of 1874, of the Red Cross Conference at Karlsruhe in 1887, of the Maritime Conference of 1889, of the Conference for the Suppression of the Traffic in Girls in 1890, and represented Russia in both the Hague Conferences.

He had large experience as an arbitrator. In 1897 he was a member of the board which settled the "Costa Rica" ship dispute between England and The Netherlands; in 1899 he was president of the tribunal which arbitrated the controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela, and again in 1903 he was a member of the tribunal chosen from the Hague Court to settle the preferential payment controversy which had arisen in connection with the attempt of Great Britain, Germany and Italy to collect claims against Venezuela by force of arms.

When the Hague Court was established after the first Hague Conference, Mr. de Martens was made a member of it from Russia, and retained this position till the time of his death.

He was a leading figure in both the Hague Conferences, being ranked at the meeting of 1899 with Andrew D. White, Sir Julian Pauncefote, Mr. Auguste Beernaert and Léon Bourgeois. In the first, it was on his proposition that the provision for international commissions of inquiry was made a part of the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes — a provision which afterwards, in the Dogger Bank affair, stood his country in